

REMARKS

Claim 16 calls for detecting the occurrence of a network event. Upon detecting the occurrence of a network event, the claim further calls for (1) determining whether the personal agent software for the event has been received from the subscriber. If so, the claim calls for (2) executing the agent software to provide the services to the subscriber.

The rejection of claim 16 cites some four or five columns of text. Other than the first element of claim 16, namely, detecting the occurrence of a network event, no effort is made to apply the reference to the other elements of the claim. Thus, it is difficult to discern the basis for the rejection.

Nonetheless, the Applicant's attorney has reviewed the cited material, including the figures, and can find no correspondence with the step pointed out in the last response of determining whether the agent software for the event has been received from the subscriber and, if the software has been received from the subscriber, taking additional action. These steps seem to be nowhere to be found within the cited reference. If they have been overlooked, it would be appreciated that the Examiner point them out specifically. If they are not there, reconsideration would seem to be appropriate.

It is noted that claims 20 and 25-27 are rejected over a single reference taken alone. Since the reference is applied under Section 103, there must be a missing element. As a matter of inescapable logic, a *prima facie* objection is not made out unless something is shown from the prior art to justify modifying the reference. While the Examiner takes official notice that the advantage of using a network that is a telephone network as a transmission system is known, this taking of official notice still does not meet the claimed limitations of implementing network call functions to a personal agent software that provides services to a telephone network subscriber. In other words, more than just using a network is called for and more than using a network for transmission is called for. Instead, claim 20, for example, calls for making available service primitives to implement network call functions to agent software that provides services to a telephone network subscriber. No such elements, including the provision of primitive network call functions or personalized services to a telephone network subscriber are suggested by any of the cited references.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Please note that claims 20 and 25 have been amended in an effort to address the Examiner's objections.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 14, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation